

THE INFLUENCE OF CERTAIN MATERNAL
ATTITUDES ON THE BEHAVIOR
OF REJECTED CHILDREN

By
RICHARD K. GREENBAUM

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY MEMBERS OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
August, 1961

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank the members of his committee, Dr. R. D. Hunkley, Dr. R. P. Brown, Dr. R. J. Anderson, Dr. G. E. Simmons and Dr. W. E. Brown, for the invaluable aid and assistance they gave him in preparing this dissertation. He would like to give special thanks to the major members of his committee, his chairman, Dr. R. D. Hunkley, and Dr. R. P. Brown, and Dr. R. J. Anderson.

He would also like to thank the former members of his committee, Dr. A. G. Mason and Dr. T. E. Smith, for their aid and assistance in helping him bring the dissertation to the final stage. Dr. A. G. Mason is due special thanks for his help in the statistical treatment of the data.

The author is deeply indebted to the entire personnel of the Tulsa County Child Welfare Clinic, many of whom gave so generously of their time in making readings and judgments in the cases used in this study. The judges included Dr. W. L. Collins, Jr., Psychiatric and director of the clinic; Dr. A. E. DeGarmo, and Dr. L. Spelt, clinical psychologists at the clinic; and Mrs. Margaret Helgeson, Mrs. Evelyn Nelson, Mrs. Jane Hollberg, and Miss Ruth Lane, the psychiatric social workers.

He would like to express his appreciation to the teachers of the Tulsa County School System for the contribution time and effort toward evaluating the children's classroom behavior.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	10
Chapter:	
I. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	1
II. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	4
III. HYPOTHESIS	7
IV. DESIGN	11
V. PROCEDURE	14
VI. RESULTS AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	23
VII. DISCUSSION	44
VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY	58
Appendix:	
I. TABLES	59
II. CALIFORNIA PARENTAL ATTENTION SCALE	61
III. CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE	66
IV. THE LAYERS SCALE	69
V. BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE	75

LIST OF TABLES

(Appendix I)

Table	Page
1. Scores on the California Attitude Scale	35
2. Classification of Child's Behavior	39
3. Peerlessness Score—Aggression to Authority	43
4. Peerlessness Score—Aggression to Peers	45
5. Peerlessness Score—Aggression to Parents	47
6. Peerlessness Score—Group Integration	49
7. Peerlessness Score—Dependence on Parents	51
8. Peerlessness Score—Dependence on Authority	53
9. Endurance Score—Group Integration	57
10. Endurance Score—Dependence on Authority	59
11. Endurance Score—Aggression to Peers	61
12. Endurance Score—Aggression to Authority	63
13. Endurance Score—Aggression to Parents	65
14. Endurance Score—Dependence on Parents	67
15. Ignoring Score—Group Integration	71
16. Ignoring Score—Dependence on Authority	73
17. Ignoring Score—Aggression to Authority	75
18. Ignoring Score—Aggression to Parents	77
19. Ignoring Score—Dependence on Parents	79
20. Ignoring Score—Aggression to Peers	81
21. Scores on the Inhibition Testing Scale	83

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

When a child enters a pediatric clinic, there is usually a great deal of speculation as to the factors responsible for the behavior that led to his referral. Much of this speculation centers around the mother-child relationship. It is the purpose of this study to investigate some of the factors involved in this relationship.

This is to be done by investigating the relationship between the philosophy of child rearing of a group of selected mothers and the behavior of their children. In addition, taking cases where the maternal philosophy of child-rearing is controlled, this study will attempt to determine if the presence or absence of maternal feeling of rejection toward their children can be responsible for a difference in their children's behavior.

There are variations of philosophies a mother can choose in raising a child. The major broad categories of these philosophies, where they can be classified, are those of overprotection of the child, ignoring of the child, and domination of the child. These are presumably present to a degree in my mother. This study will measure them with a scale previously devised for this purpose. (Appendix II).

A mother may have *any* feelings toward a child. These can be determined on a present-absent criterion. The mothers in this study have been selected for having one such feeling toward at least one of their children, viz., rejection. This is a feeling toward a child which

is here defined as one of a primary and consistent dislike of the child characterized by such or such attitudes and/or actions based on this feeling and the absence of any likelihood of a break, strong, positive feeling for their child aside from that of rejecting the child in the family.

The group of children studied here has been rejected by their mothers. This rejection and the fact that they behave in such a manner considered clinically pathological, distinguishes them from other children of this family. The other group is identical to the first group in all ways except as pointed out, here that it is neither rejected nor pathological. This will form a control group to contrast with the rejected group. This group was selected in an attempt to keep the philosophy of child-rearing of the mother as a constant.

There are several possible ways to approach this problem, as shall be seen in surveying the literature. Two of these ways are used in this study. One of these approaches is to use the mother's philosophy of child-rearing as an independent variable and the child's behavior as a dependent variable. The other is to eliminate the mother's philosophy of child-rearing as a factor by using non-rejected siblings as a control group. The presence or absence of the maternal attitude of rejection becomes the independent variable, and the child's behavior the dependent variable. A factorial design will be the technique employed in this study.

The behavior of the child is considered in terms of a few significant aspects selected for their ease of determination for rating purposes and their consistency within the age groups studied. These aspects were

considered significant in typifying behavior that differentiates the child with a behavior problem from the normal child as well as the syndrome of the child with behavior problems.

There are two broad hypotheses that follow from this procedure. There are that there is a significant difference between the behavior of the rejected and the non-rejected group in terms of the aspects of behavior mentioned in this study, and that there is a significant relationship between the extent of ignoring, dominance, and possessiveness present in the mother's philosophy of child-rearing and the behavior of her child. The child's behavior is considered in terms of his position as an aggression-withdrawn syndrome with respect to peers, others, and authoritarian figures other than mothers; his position as a dependent-independent syndrome with respect to others and authoritarian figures other than mothers, and his position as a syndrome indicating his degree of integration into a group of peers. All these factors are considered separately.

It is expected that the results obtained will have meaning in illustrating some of the factors operative in determining the behavior patterns of some children who are patients in child guidance clinics, specifically those children who are rejected. Some of the potential implications of my results will be considered in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

In a study of this nature, it is necessary to consider the practical significance of both negative and positive results. These should be considered in terms of their implications toward the expansion of knowledge, and also for their specific practical applications in the diagnosis and treatment of behavior disorders and the development of behavior patterns in children.

The implications of this study, negative or positive, must be stated in the group used in the study, be restricted to children with behavior pathology who are referred to clinics. It is definitely possible, even probable, that children whose mothers have the same feelings toward them as do the mothers of the children in this study and have similar or perhaps even identical attitudes in terms of being distrustful, ignoring, or persecuting of the child, do not have behavior pathology and that the conclusions drawn from this study do not apply to them. It is also important to note that the children who have behavior pathology of the type that is not apparent to a lay observer tend to be less likely to come into the clinic, and as the control group is drawn in terms of those who have behavior disorders which tend toward the extreme, even within the group which tends toward extreme behavior, the group in this study necessarily represents those children in whom the behavior is internalized, rather than solely responsive to an external stimulus. Thus children with such behavior are referred to the clinic, and it

would appear that environmental and parental manipulations could result in rejection of systems, the cases were referred elsewhere, moved no further into the clinic procedure, and so were not available for this study.

Thus, the implications drawn below are made only in terms of the patterns that exist in those situations which actually do result in development of clinical psychology within a child. These implications should not be extrapolated to general behavior development except in so far as it appears sound. Further, generalizations should only be made with the understanding that the information was not obtained from a normal sample as determined by the criteria.

Within the framework of the experimental design there are four possible conclusions. These provide conclusions and their implications for the children's behavior as related to psychopathology are:

First: That there is no relationship between external philosophy of child-rearing and the behavior of the child and there is no relationship between the rejection or non-rejection of the child and the behavior of the child. This would suggest that in the group studied the factors related to their behavior would be beyond the scope of this dissertation and no implications beyond that may be drawn from the data available.

Second: That there is no relationship between the philosophy of child-rearing and the behavior patterns of the children, yet there is a relationship between the rejection or the non-rejection of the child and the child's behavior. This would suggest that where rejection is a factor the philosophy of the mother is not important as a determinant of

the behavior pattern of the child, but that the factor of rejection is.

Third: that the philosophy of the author of child-rearing is related to the behavior of the child but the rejection or the acceptance of a child is not. This would suggest that rejection is not an important factor in determining the behavior of the child, but maternal philosophy is.

Fourth: that both are related to the behavior of the child. This would suggest that where rejection is present, both the rejection and the maternal philosophy of child-rearing are of importance in determining the behavior of the child.

The first possible conclusion has no clear implication for the handling of the case in the clinic. The others do.

If it develops that there is no relationship between the maternal philosophy of child-rearing and the behavior of the child and there is a relationship between the rejection - non-rejection of the child and his behavior, it would suggest that when dealing with the mother in the clinic, emphasis in the treatment of rejected children should be focused on maternal feeling rather than the philosophy of child-rearing. It would imply that early in contact with the mother it would be desirable to explore the area of the mother's feeling for the child rather automatically until the presence or absence of rejection was established to the satisfaction of the therapist. Should rejection be present, it would then appear to be desirable to try to devote a large portion of the therapy to the handling this feeling of rejection.

In dealing with the child, the emphasis my well be placed on the mother's feelings and what they mean to the child.

If it appears that the philosophy of child-rearing is related to the behavior pattern of a rejected child and the factor of rejection is not, it would then seem to be desirable to place the emphasis on the philosophy rather than on the feeling both in dealing with the mother and with the child.

If both the philosophy of child-rearing and rejection are related to the child's behavior, the expectation would be that in clinical cases with maternal rejection, the attitude of rejection would determine the presence or absence of behavior pathology and the syndrome would be determined by the maternal philosophy. Under these circumstances the therapist can be less active in focusing the discussion he centers around either the mother's philosophy of feeling with some confidence that the then spent in handling maternal, either philosophy or feeling, is apt to be of value in the treatment of the case.

A major implication then is potential contribution to the question of whether it makes any difference what philosophy of raising a child is used as long as a mother has positive feelings towards the child. This bears upon the whole question of variable philosophies in child-rearing. The questions that arise out of a variety of successful methods of raising children to be mentally sound healthy adults and perhaps this investigation may provide a partial answer to the enigmatic fact that it is necessary to adhere rigorously to one particular philosophy in order to raise a mentally healthy child.

As mentioned above, the implications of this study must necessarily be limited because of the nature of the population dealt with. The rejected and non-rejected groups are siblings and we have

the same authors. For each set of siblings the mother presumably has the same philosophy of child-rearing. However, she has different feelings toward each child. Should there be a significant difference between the behavior of the rejected and non-rejected children, there would be evidence that this difference is due to the difference in feeling the mother has toward each sibling. There would then be reason to hypothesize that it is possible that with any philosophy of child-rearing the emotional relationship between the mother and the child may be responsible for producing behavioral differences in the child. The evidence in this study is not sufficient to permit consideration of the converse, viz., that any philosophy carried to extremes may produce behavior pathology regardless of the feeling of the mother. Such a theory is popular among clinicians, as is the further belief that these extremes of domination, ignoring, or overprotection produce predictable responses in a child. This leads then to produce diagnostic evaluations of the mother based upon the child's pattern of behavior. Results of this study should contribute to strengthening or weakening the assurance with which such procedures could be confidently undertaken prior to determining the presence or absence of a feeling of rejection in the mother.

This study deals strictly with the poor mother-child relationship, and though it deals only with a segment of such a relationship, within a small group of those who experience such a relationship, it is hoped that it may throw some light on certain limited aspects in its development, and on what is and is not important in the progression and its effect on personality development as it pertains to the rejected child.

CHAPTER III

INTRODUCTION

First consideration of the problem of the effects of parental attitudes may be divided into theoretical considerations of the problem and experimental investigations. Experimental investigations may further be subdivided into, first, those in which the child's behavior is the independent variable and the parent's behavior is the dependent variable; second, those in which the parent's behavior is the independent variable and the child's behavior the dependent variable; third, those in which the attitude of the parent is the independent variable and the behavior of the child the dependent variable, and fourth, those in which the attitude of the parent is the dependent variable and the behavior of the child the independent variable.

Early consideration of the problem was given by Freud (2) who said, "I have found that those who suffer themselves preferred or feared (i.e., children) by a mother manifest in their lives that resistance in themselves." He went on to leave the implication that the converse was also true. Levy, in his book (11) and at least one article (10) is greatly concerned with this expression. He stated that he considered emotional deprivation the key factor in the development of psychopathology. His major published interest was in the area of the overprotection mother. He considered that overprotection takes five forms, pass protection, overprotection as a compensatory

response to guilt, child overprotection, child overprotection, and overprotection due to the presence of a non-natural or intra-natural reaction or feeling on the part of the mother. The guilt type of overprotection is considered primarily a reaction-formation to rejection. For a mother who rejects her son was most impressed with the length of time the child was fed at the breast. He found a statistically significant difference in the length of time rejected and non-rejected children spent breast feeding. The rejected children were breast fed for a shorter period of time. He theorized still further that the devoted child of the rejected parent was not alone rather was of essentially a schizoid personality and as permitted or needed the child to dominate her. He felt that the mother was here, that the child who is schizoid, is so as a consequence of the mother's being dominating. He concluded that the behavior on the part of the mother was as important as the mother's feeling towards the child in the determination of pathology, but that feeling was rather crucial.

Sumner (19), after considering the sources of rejection by quoting Tillyer on the fact that Tillyer observed that the majority of rejecting mothers were "lonely, unstable, nervous, and in some extent, actually psychotic," as well as noting the factors of imagination and economic distress induced by the birth of a child, proceeded to differentiate between maternal and paternal rejection. He felt they were quite different, and that the father rejects the child either because he accepts and shares his wife's feeling of rejection to his marital union and competitiveness, or because of jealousy or rivalry with the child, or because of extreme identification with the child where

self-induced anxiety. That is, he projects the hatred of himself onto his child, hence considered parental rejection rather rare, a view with which the writer is inclined to agree.

When maternal rejection occurs, he feels that it manifests itself in three forms. These he listed as: (a) overt hostility and neglect, (b) perfectionism, and (c) compensatory overprotection. These are the three forms of parental behavior that have been considered as independent variables in this study.

Overt hostility and neglect ("ignoring" in this study) are, according to Harter, presumed to have the following psychological consequences: babies lack zest for life and growth, and as adults become deviants producing a shallow affect resulting in an unresponsive personality. This total condition results in sexual aggressiveness, stealing, lying, and a general lack of emotional response in the child.

Perfectionism ("distinction" in this study) is presumed to result in the child a sense of dissatisfaction with himself. According to Harter,

The experience of being denied approval except by attaining the high standard set for his success has to work again and again for goodness, diligence, cleanliness, and orderliness. This overemphasis, which has insisted upon perfect deed habits, perfect toilet habits at the earliest time, and perfect behavior in general, develops into fundamental background for development of obsessive-compulsive trends. The constant frustrations arising from the inability to reach the impossible standards in the child as attitudes of defeat, hopelessness, and lack of self-confidence. The neglected child retaliates with delinquency or other forms of hostile aggressiveness; the spoiled child gets back by dominating the playmate; the overindulgent parents often come to look for the reasons of parental disapproval within himself and hence live perpetually guilty and insecure. (2)

Compensatory overprotection ("protectionism" in this study) is said to result in the same behavior patterns as those found in coercive behavior, save that it results in a delay in the maturation of the child with protracted dependence upon the mother and consequent lack of development of his own ego strength. Tengg (15) felt that the consequences were not so clearly predictable, but that, "the age and experience of the child will affect the response to such treatment." In general, Pavlov (16) agreed with Skinner in classifying parental behavior but he further divided the types into adverse attitudes and adverse behavior.

In tracing the various theoretical developments, it is evident that the theoretical constructs have become more and more refined and predict more and more a specific pattern of behavior as a specific response to a parental attitude. At the same time, the emphasis on parental attitudes has shifted from general considerations to the way they feel and the way they act. There is unanimous agreement that parental attitudes and behavior do have a definite effect upon children's behavior, and the question resolves itself into just what effect they have.

Baron (17) studied the effects of tension in parental relationships as associated with behavior in preschool children's adjustment. He used parental behavior as the independent variable and the child's

behavior as the dependent variable. The considered eight factors in child adjustment. Of these eight factors she found that parental over-adjustment and parental tendency toward either extreme over-encouragement or extreme punishment was positively correlated with adjustment in children to a significant degree. On the other hand, she found that lack of consideration on the part of the parents, lack of cooperation between the marital partners, presence or frequency of extra-marital affairs, inability to discuss differences freely, a feeling of receiving too little affection, mother's disagreement with friends and relatives concerning work, were not significantly related to the adjustment of the child. These findings would then essentially agree with the theoretical concepts that the tendency toward over-encouragement on the part of the parents, or allowing of the child to become discontent, affects the behavior of the child. Her findings also suggested that mental adjustment reflects types of problem in the parents which appear to be related to the factors in the childhood adjustment of the parents. Precise relationships here were neither investigated nor inferred.

Johnson (11) varied the procedure in his study of the behavior of parents of schizophrenic, neurotic, and normal children. Here the behavior of the children was the independent variable, the parental behavior the dependent. Four graduate students were used as judges. The father was judged as being either demanding, antagonistic, superficial, encouraging, protective, or indulgent. The parents of the same sex as the schizophrenic child were found to be demanding, antagonistic, and they in no way encouraged the child. The parents of the opposite sex to that of the schizophrenic child exhibited the same behavior. The

parents of normal children exhibited the most positive pattern of behavior as that of the parents of the schizophrenic children; that is, they encouraged the child to engage in constructive activities, they were not overly demanding nor were they antagonistic toward the child. He found the same pattern in parents of normal children as he did in the parents of the schizophrenic children. It may be noted that apparently none of the judges was able to judge any of the parental behavior as either superficial, protective, or indulgent. The evidence seems to be clear that certain types of behavior on the part of parents may lead to behavior pathology in their children, but the precise relationship between the parental behavior and the child's syndrome is uncertain.

Johnson (2) examined parental behavior and attitudes as independent variables with the behavior of children as a dependent variable. He classified the parents into rejecting, overprotective, or restrictive in their behavior to the children, but he did so entirely on the basis of how the pupils saw their parents. His results were negative; he found no pattern in the pupils' behavior related to parental attitudes. It is important to note that he really had no valid criterion of parental attitudes, for in the age group with which he worked (Junior High School pupils), debates are fairly well built up and children are capable to freely verbalize concerning parental attitudes in a classroom situation.

A few studies were done in which the attitude of the parents was the independent variable and the behavior of the child was the dependent variable. Flagel (3) stated the expectations of experiments

using this type of experimental design, that he said that when the parents tend to be overindulgent of the children, the children are quite likely to be rebellious to all authority figures, including their parents. He also explained the tremendous influence of parental attitudes and feelings on children's behavior.

Lowell [13, 14] in his studies of the psychodynamics of maternal rejection used this experimental design. The first study received some fairly serious criticism. It lacked a control group and adequate criteria for establishing rejection. His criterion was merely that he considered adequate verbal expression on the part of the parent. He replicated 30 not more than years later in which he set up criteria for rejection by the mother. These criteria were the presence of any three out of ten factors. These ten factors were: severe punishment to the child, neglect of the child, nagging of the child, indifference, invitation, threatening to send the child away, inconsistent handling, emptiness of the child, refusing spending money on him, and unfavorable comparison of the child with a sibling. He concluded that when there was a great deal of rejection, the child was aggressive. When parental feelings were mixed, as the father was overprotective, there was no aggression. His general conclusions were that boys were aggressive when handled in a hostile fashion, and exhibited mixed behavior, that of aggression and withdrawal, when handled in an inconsistent fashion. Girls, he felt, showed aggression as a result of withdrawal and inconsistent maternal handling, or when the father was hostile toward them, and exhibited mixed behavior as a result of a partly

inville distressed. Bowlb suggested that there was an opposite reaction, determined by the use of the child, to attitudes on the part of the parents. He further concluded that the reaction of the child is predictable in cases of disturbed children if the attitudes of the parents were known.

Sprafkin (21) studied the effect of parental acceptance and rejection on the behavior of the children. He compared 37 rejected and 37 non-rejected children in specifically selected cases. He concluded that rejection led to behavior pathology and general delinquency trends. These trends he considered to be an aggressive response to rejection. They also led, he felt, to difficulty with established situations and conventions, and to an excess of other activity. He concluded, "The rejected child is aggressive, rebellious, hyperactive, careless, attention-getting, troublesome in school, lacking in concentration, and showing other evidence of emotional lability."²

This study was followed in turn by Jacob's (22) who studied the parent's expressed attitude and the relation it had to the behavior of children. He concluded that, contrary to previous findings, the child's behavior was unrelated to the expressed attitude of the parent, but it was correlated with whether the parent was liberal or not in his or her expectations of the child. He, however, followed Jacobson in that the criterion for the parental attitude was the child's own statement of the parental attitude. The validity of this particular source of information as a criterion for determining parental attitude seems to be quite questionable.

Quite recently, Schaefer, Schaefer, and Thomas (23) did a study

of parental behavior using Chesney's (4) rating system of which more will be said later. As part of a general survey, they found that one-quarter of the parents were rejecting. These parents were divided into two types, the tough or ignoring parent, and the actively rejecting parent. They did not go into detail in their results in respect to this, but felt in cases in which the parents were actively rejecting, the child had [low emotional] control and where the parents were casual about their rejection, that is, focused on other things besides their children to the point where the child was rejected, the child did have emotional, better control, and was fairly cheerful. They set up a fairly adequate criteria for rejection by the parent on the basis of clinical notes and agreement by clinical personnel. In cases where parents met these criteria, they found that sometimes the child became self-sufficient, and there was no evidence of behavior pathology. They also felt, and this apparently was an impression of theirs, that the presence or absence of behavior pathology was related to the degree of rejection by the parents.

Some general conclusions can be drawn from these four studies. The first is that there is a relation between the parent's feeling of rejection and the behavior of the child. The second is that it is difficult to determine the parent's feelings of rejection on the basis of the child's own statement. The third is that there it can be determined adequately and is present, in some cases the child's behavior is pathological, and in some cases it is not. There is also the impression that this difference may be due to a difference in the degree of rejection present.

The simplest way of approaching the problem in terms of techniques is to take a group of children who are behavior problems and compare them with a group of children who are not behavior problems.

Battistero (8) did an early study using this technique. In her investigation of pre-school children's behavior and various factors in the home. She found high positive correlations in her investigation; she found that overactivity in the home was correlated with inattention and withdrawal in school. Speaking in the home, she found, was related to aggression and seeking attention by the child in school. That she considered positive factors in the home she found correlated with positive behavior in school. Then she found the less attention was given she found the child more in school.

This was a longitudinal study of 195 children in which the children were studied before they went to school to their behavior at school was studied by means of a rating sheet. She found a positive transfer of behavior from the home situation to the school. Where the parents played with the children at home, she found the children had greater security in the school situation. Where the parents talked to the children, she found the children had social difficulties in school. Where the parents gave the children responsibilities at home, she found that there was a relation to the children's self-willness in school.

Nineteen parental traits were correlated with 71 children's traits, and all traits were graded in terms of their presence or absence. The correlations she obtained were not particularly high. There were significant correlations on only seven of the factors she studied.

In her article, Tysagoff (21) surveyed the literature on studies of pre-school children. She reported the studies replicated work of Leath. Leath used 15 non-related primary school children and studied the effects of overprotection and rejection. She concluded that rejected children tend to show antisocial trends and a relatively high degree of anxiety. That is, they attempt to dominate other children. When the children were not only rejected, but also over-protected, she felt that the children had nervous habits and were insecure and, in general, exhibited a somewhat different behavior pattern from those children that were rejected but not over-protected. This has considerable bearing upon the present issue, since Leath is, in effect, saying that the form of the rejection is important in determining the behavior pattern of the child.

Two additional studies deserve mention here. They are not easily classified as to constants and variables but are essentially studies of relations between factors. Balle (17) studied the relation between parental authority and children's behavior. She interpreted the behavior of the parents along the dimensions of authority-democracy, freedom-restrictiveness, and mild discipline-severe discipline. She studied the effect of these factors on the relation between the children and their parents, and between siblings. She did this by having the children rate themselves, the parents rate their children, the teacher rate the children, and, in addition, used projective techniques and play analysis of the children. She concluded that freedom and democratic relations within the home led to well-adjusted behavior of the children.

Hinsworth (2) did a similar type of study of variables within the home situation. She studied the criteria for rejection in some detail. She arrived at a listing of criteria from many sources. These criteria were divided into four categories. A few samples of these criteria were: The parent utilizes the child consistently, the parent sends the child away to school or the parent threatens to turn his over to an outside authority. The criteria for reversed rejection, contained in category four, were: the parent actually discards the child, or the parent actually turns the child over to an outside authority. Her general conclusion was that rejected children were more aggressive than other children.

In surveying these studies, the general conclusion is that rejection generally, though not always, leads to aggression, delinquency, and affection-seeking in the child. There is general agreement that rejection may manifest itself in three basic forms, but there is some difference of opinion as to the effects of these manifestations in terms of the child's behavior. It is this question which this thesis proposes to investigate.

CHAPTER IV

SCALES

In the course of this experiment four scales were used. One scale was the Parental Attitude Scale developed by Borton (1934) the second, a rating scale used to ascertain the behavior of the children the third, the Ten Items Scale (25), used for a similar purpose, and the fourth, a profile scale used to determine the degree of rejection the mother felt toward her child of the control group.

How does Burt (17) decide the rating of the home character was practical and could be accomplished in a scientific manner (provided the scales were comparable and equivalent, and the raters employed possessed a variety of such scaling techniques have been developed. Very few of these scales have been concerned with the assessment of parental, especially maternal, attitudes. Actually, prior to 1940, no accepted and validated scale existed. Nothing was done by an intensive study of the home situation using a rating scale such as that developed by Gumpster (24), with his following scale. In developing the scale he felt that any such instrument was good, provided the rater was skilled in its use, and it met his criteria. These were that it be clear, relevant, based on facts, concise in scope, inclusive, and have variety, objectivity, spread, and be valid and independent of the age of the person being rated. In the scale he met these criteria that he had set up. Unfortunately, it required a home visit of some length of time in order to fill in etc. If the information obtained is valuable it is worth this

unaided effort in such experimental investigations, however, the method has not been found to be too practical. It was, as noted before, used by Hilfer, et al, (1), in their investigation of the relation of parental attitude to children's behavior.

Stokes, dissatisfied with the length of time such procedure took, developed a scale which could be administered more rapidly. He validated it on the basis of direct observation with different groups of subjects, and he felt that although some of the variables involved were dropped, it provided a good measure of parental attitude in terms of the items he retained from his extensive original list. Thus he scored and then readministered them to determine the validity of the scale. The results came out as predicted, indicating the validity of the scale. He further validated it on the basis of the face validity. In addition, he compared the scores of psychologists, of mothers of normal children, and of mothers of problem children, each with the other. He found significant differences between all pairs of groups. Finally, he validated it by an item analysis and obtained significant correlations.

As the only scale in existence measuring parental attitudes which was adequately validated and on which the attitudes could be scored, this scale was selected as a basis of determining parental attitude in this study. Furthermore, interviews were held with the authors by the examiner, one of the purposes of which was to determine the internal validity and see how it related to the scale scores. This was done solely by clinical inspection and on this basis the scale appeared to be extremely valid.

The rating of children presented a problem in terms of securing

a rating scale that was at once simple, accurate and could be utilized equally well by professional and non-professional people. To this end the author devised a simple check scale. (Appendix III). It was felt that it would be desirable to secure more basis for checking the two earlier rating scales against an outside criterion when the behavior rating scale was filled out by non-psychologically trained personnel, e.g., public school teachers. For that purpose, the two most popular scales for the rating of child behavior in the classroom were examined. The Henggerty-Class/Rooms Behavior Rating Scale was eliminated as being too complex for classroom use. The scale developed by Van Alstyne, (2) and Appendix IV] was selected as the more suitable scale for this purpose. Some of the questions on the scale which were not applicable to the relationship studied on the rating scale devised by the author were eliminated. The Van Alstyne Scale was used as a supplementary device to increase the accuracy of the information on the child's school behavior.

There was a high degree of consistency of direction in the ratings of the teachers and children. That is, that differences there were in the ratings were between such ratings as child aggression and extreme aggression. Out of the 126 possible ratings in the experimental group (teachers very often did not rate relative to the parents and as parental ratings by teachers were not considered in the question of validation) in only 18 cases did the teachers and children rate the child's behavior on opposite ends of the continuum.

Whenever there was disagreement, the Van Alstyne Scale was referred to, the case investigated, and if it appeared that the teacher's rating was accurate, the ratings of the children and the teacher were

averages. On the basis of the very high agreement noted above, the averages were used and the scales are considered highly valid.

The behavior rating scale was scored by assigning numerical ratings from 1 to 5. For the aggression-withdrawal continua, 1 represented extreme aggression, 5 extreme withdrawal. For the dependence-independence continua, 1 represented extreme dependence, 5 extreme independence. For the group integration continua, 1 represented group leadership, 5 withdrawal from the group.

The graphic scale for the rating of the rejection of the control group was designed to determine the natural feeling for a sibling of the child selected for the experimental group. The basis for this selection will be given in the next chapter. This scale (Appendix F) was filled out by two clinicians not including the mother. The results of the ratings of rejection by the clinicians were averaged to obtain a measure of the degree of rejection-nonrejection which the mother felt toward the sibling.

This scale was based upon the criteria set up by Bowlby (14). His two criteria of rejection were listed and the rater evaluated the presence or absence of each of these factors. Following that evaluation, they then rated the degree of rejection the mother felt toward the sibling upon a five-point scale. The scale was validated by using Bowlby's criteria for the presence of three out of ten factors where rejection is present and for the absence of at least eight of these factors where no rejection is present. The criteria of the presence or absence of at least three factors was met by requiring six "yes" answers on the ten-factor rating to be given by both clinicians who rated the case,

Let₁, there had to be a total of six between the two of them, if one
 person was present according to their ratings, and less than six if no
 rejection was present. The ratings of the two assistants correlated
 $\pm .77$.

These four scales were the source of all data upon which con-
 siderations were based.

CHAPTER 7

PROCEDURE

The procedure followed in the selection of subjects in both the experimental and control groups, the initial visit, and the criteria established follows.

Fifty nine children were selected from the clinic cases of a child guidance clinic in Duval County, Florida. These cases constituted the experimental group and were selected on the basis of the following factors being present:

1. Injuries on the part of the subject.
2. Behavioral pathology was present in the child.
3. There was an diagnosis of psychosis or brain damage.
4. There was an American culture in the home.
5. The family came from the middle or upper-lower socio-economic group.
6. There was no obvious authoritarian figure present in the immediate environment.
7. The child was a member of the white race.
8. The child had been a member of the family since he was two years old.
9. The family lived in an urban environment.
10. There were less than five children in the family.
11. The child had at least normal intelligence.
12. The child was between the ages of six and twelve at the time he first came into contact with the clinic.
13. The family unit was complete up to within two years of the time he came into contact with the clinic.

The experimental group was divided into 14 males and 14 females. One sibling was chosen in all cases that had a sibling or siblings in school. If the child had more than one sibling, the one nearest in age and sex was chosen. These siblings constituted the control group. Twenty-nine cases were obtained, 17 younger and 12 older than their sibling in the experimental group. There were 17 males and 12 females in this group. The age range of the control group was from 4 to 14 years of age. The groups were divided as follows:

Experimental Group			Control Group		
Age	No. of Cases		Age	No. of Cases	
	Males	Females		Males	Females
4 yrs.	0	0	4 yrs.	0	1
5 yrs.	3	0	5 yrs.	2	1
6 yrs.	4	1	6 yrs.	1	1
7 yrs.	7	1	7 yrs.	0	1
8 yrs.	11	1	8 yrs.	2	2
9 yrs.	6	3	9 yrs.	2	0
10 yrs.	7	0	10 yrs.	1	0
11 yrs.	0	0	11 yrs.	1	0
12 yrs.	0	0	12 yrs.	1	0

Refusals on the part of the mother of the experimental subject was determined by clinical agreement. In all cases, there was agreement between the clinician in contact with the mother, the mother, and a third clinician who was in some way involved in the case. In all cases, except one, the parent was seen in the clinic for four or more sessions before the decision as to whether the parent was refusing or not was

note. In the one case where the parent was not seen four times, she was attempting to rid the clinic to get rid of the child, because she, "could not stand him". In most cases the mothers were seen more often than the four times mentioned the children and very frequently the mother had reached the point where she was able to verbalize freely her negative feelings about the child.

Her feelings toward the child in the control group were determined by the rating scale mentioned above. The difference in this procedure was due to the greater amount of information available in respect to the experimental child, the child referred to the clinic. The restrictions on the selection of cases were introduced with the idea of eliminating as many confounding variables as possible, in order to ascertain and compare the effect of the maternal attitude upon the child's behavior.

The presence of behavior pathology and the absence of psychosis were determined by standard diagnostic procedures with the child. The determination of maternal culture was made in pretest social research interview, and was made essentially on the basis of the English language being spoken at home and what appeared to be the cultural expectations and criteria of the parents.

Stage-specific status was determined by three of Thomas's (1911) four criteria. The fourth criterion, type of resistance, was not considered applicable to this group. The criteria used were source of income, dwelling area, and father's occupation. These two of the three groupings fall into the three, four or five point classification on the seven-point scale and the other lay between two and six inclusive. The status was established within the limits of desired grouping.

In view of the fact that maternal attitudes were being studied, it was felt necessary to know that other socialization figures within the family whose attitudes were not being studied and who may have an effect upon the behavior of the child, did not disturb the results. Therefore, if a relative lived in the home and exercised any control over the children, or lived on the same block and exercised control over the children, cases were eliminated from consideration.

Where the child was adopted, the criterion set here was that he must have been adopted before he reached the age of one year old. It was felt that in these circumstances, the child's experience in growing up would be essentially the same as that of a child living with his true parents. However, in some cases, the child was adopted by a step-father at a somewhat later age. In all these cases, the child was living and had continued to live with the true mother. Since it was essentially the mother's attitude that was being studied, it was felt that this would not be a serious factor in affecting the behavior of the child.

After all these criteria had been met, the mother was called in for an interview. The purpose of this interview was to secure information relating to the records which were pertinent to this study. Also a clinical judgment was made of her attitude toward the child and the scale was clinically validated. The mother was asked to make a statement of her attitude toward the child. She was asked her impression of her husband's attitude, and an estimate of his position in the family structure, that is, her husband's role and how much he had to say about raising the children. She was asked her evaluation of the child's response to her. Following the interview, which began with the purpose

of the experiment being explained to her, she was given the Cohen California Attitude Scale for Parents, told to fill it out in terms of her feeling when she was in a relaxed mood and in terms of her attitude toward her own child or children. If in doubt, she was to answer as best she could in terms of her first feelings. She was given another copy of the scale for her husband and was requested to return it to the clinic after it was completed. Although the effect of these interventions does not appear quantitatively in the results, it is felt they greatly increased the validity of the study by keeping as constant as possible the attitude that the parent's had when filling out the scale, and enabling them to understand the purpose and importance of filling it out as honestly as possible.

The wife's expression of her husband's attitude proved to be almost worthless, since almost all the mothers were quite defensive about their husbands. The intervention did prove very valuable in securing the information starting from the records.

Following the interview with the parent, a copy of the behavior rating scale and a copy of the Ten Anger Scale were mailed out to the school, to be filled out by the teacher. These were accompanied by an explanatory letter. At the same time, the mother and another clinician involved in the case each filled out a behavior rating scale on the child. The mother then compared these rating scales. Where there was a disagreement arising on any item, the mother and the other clinician conferred to determine the cause of the discrepancy and resolve the disagreement. All available sources of information were used in an attempt to obtain a pooled estimate. This method is one thing that was a

product of the opinion of two clinicians.

The same procedure was followed with respect to the ratings that comprised the control group.

where there was a difference on the rating scale between the teacher and the pooled clinical judgment, the scores were generally averaged. In cases where the disagreement lay in terms of integration into the group, more weight was given to the teacher's evaluation, i.e., if the teacher's evaluation agreed with her description of the child's behavior on the five climate scale in respect to the child's integration into a group of peers, her judgment was accepted on this. The final rating entered for the child was, in summary, determined as follows:

In relation to parents, to other authority figures, and aggression towards peers, the clinical judgments were entered at separately, and disagreements turned out in conference. The resultant clinical judgment was then averaged with the teacher's judgment. With respect to peer relationships in terms of group integration, if there was a disagreement, more credence was placed on the teacher's judgment if it appeared to be substantiated.

The scoring of the parental attitudes scale was done by mother's opinion. This gives three scores for each parent, one for dominance, one for ignoring and one for permissiveness.

The scores were converted to comparable scores by multiplying the score on permissiveness by 1.5; the score on ignoring by 1.5. Since there were an unequal number of questions in the different categories and the permissive score was only one-half the dominant score, while the ignoring score was only one-third the dominant score, weighting the

scores, as described above made the scores comparable. This procedure is as we effected the comparisons; it was done to permit comparison of scores for the same period by sensory examination.

Rejection grades (Appendix F) were scored by assigning numbers from 1 to 5 along the continuum of rejection; 1 indicating severe rejection, and 5 indicating no rejection. The scores of the ten distillates the test tube ratings in each case were averaged. The average score was then placed into a group of either rejection or no rejection. Scores from 1 to 4.5 were considered indicative of rejecting scores ranging from 1 to 5 were considered indicative of the absence of rejection. (Table II). Six cases received scores between 1 and 4.5 and these cases were eliminated from the control group. These cases are indicated by an asterisk in Table II.

When these procedures were completed, the data were ready for analysis.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Data were analyzed by the use of the F test of significance of difference, the Pearson Coefficient of Correlation, and the Point Bi-Seriesal Correlation, depending upon the hypothesis being investigated. Standard formulas and procedures were used in all cases. The statistical limits given throughout this chapter are at the .05 level of confidence. They were obtained by entering the F table at the appropriate level for each F , and multiplying the number secured by the standard error of the respective correlations. The F is $F_{1, 10}$ for Hypotheses II, IV, V, VI and VII. The F is $F_{2, 10}$ for Hypothesis III.

In investigating the hypothesis that control and experimental groups represented random samples drawn from the same population, the significance of difference between means was ascertained for each behavior trait using the t point scale. (Table I and Appendix III).

Hypothesis I:

1. There is a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the direction of aggression they show when with their peers. The means of the control and experimental groups are 8.45 and 8.15, respectively, with a F of 3.06. This difference is significant at the .05 level of confidence. The experimental group appears to be more aggressive than with their peers.

2. There is a significant difference between the experimental

and control groups in the amount of integration they show into a group of peers. The means of the control and experimental groups are 3.70 and 3.51, respectively, with a "t" of 3.13. This difference is significant at the .01 level of confidence. The experimental group appears to be less integrated into a group of peers.

3. There is a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the direction of aggression they show when with their parents. The means of the control and experimental groups are 3.07 and 3.13, respectively, with a "t" of 4.00. This difference is significant at the .001 level of confidence. The experimental group appears to be more aggressive toward their parents.

4. There is a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the amount of dependence they show in relations with their parents. The means of the control and experimental groups are 3.07 and 3.16, respectively, with a "t" of 3.31. This difference is significant at the .01 level of confidence. The experimental group appears to be more dependent on their parents.

5. There is a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the direction of aggression they show when with authoritarian figures other than their parents. The means of the control and experimental groups are 3.07 and 3.14, respectively, with a "t" of 4.26. This difference is significant at the .001 level of confidence. The experimental group appears to be more aggressive toward authoritarian figures other than their parents.

6. There is a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the amount of dependence they show in relations

with authoritarian figures other than their parents. The means of the control and experimental groups are 2.17 and 2.55, respectively, with a t of 2.36. This difference is significant at the .05 level of confidence. The experimental group appears to be more dependent on authoritarian figures other than their parents.

All three results are significant at the .05 level of confidence, at least, and indicate that there are significant differences between the experimental and the control groups in terms of their behavior in all aspects considered. These differences appear to be that the rejected children show more extreme behavior than do their non-rejected siblings. This is mostly in the direction of the rejected group showing more aggression, more dependence, and less integration into a group of peers.

There was a marked difference in the age distribution of the experimental and control groups. It was postulated that the differences in behavior between the experimental and control groups might be due to this difference in age frequencies between the groups. To investigate this, an hypothesis was established that there is a relationship between the age of the child and the behavior of the child. This hypothesis was tested using the Pearson Coefficient of Correlation.

Hypothesis II:

1. There is a relationship between the age of rejected children and the direction of aggression that they show with peers.

$r = + .05$. The fiducial limits are $+ .25$ and $- .25$.

2. There is a relationship between the age of rejected children and the amount of integration they show into a group of peers.

$r = +.20$. The fiducial limits are $+.40$ and $-.40$.

3. There is a relationship between age of rejected children and the direction of aggression they show toward their parents.

$r = +.13$. The fiducial limits are $+.39$ and $-.13$.

4. There is a relationship between age of rejected children and the amount of dependency they show in relation to their parents.

$r = -.16$. The fiducial limits are $+.30$ and $-.46$.

5. There is a relationship between age of rejected children and the direction of aggression they show toward authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$r = +.16$. The fiducial limits are $+.30$ and $-.46$.

6. There is a relationship between age of rejected children and the amount of dependency they show in relation to authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$r = +.11$. The fiducial limits are $+.30$ and $-.46$.

The magnitudes of the correlations within their fiducial limits are such that no profitable relationships have been established between the age of the rejected children and the behavior traits as measured here. From these results it may be concluded that the differences established between the experimental and control groups are not due to the difference in the age distribution between the two groups.

It is further postulated that the differences between the two groups may be due to a difference in the sex distribution, inasmuch as about one-quarter of the experimental group and about one-half of the control group are females. To investigate this possibility, partial bi-variate correlations were run between sex and behavior.

hypothesis IIIc

1. There is a relationship between sex and the direction of aggression non-rejected children show when with their parents.

$$r_{ps} = +.43. \text{ The fiducial limits are } +.18 \text{ and } -.18.$$

2. There is a relationship between sex and the amount of integration non-rejected children show into a group of peers.

$$r_{ps} = +.47. \text{ The fiducial limits are } +.18 \text{ and } -.18.$$

3. There is a relationship between sex and the direction of aggression non-rejected children show toward their parents.

$$r_{ps} = +.46. \text{ The fiducial limits are } +.18 \text{ and } -.18.$$

4. There is a relationship between sex and the amount of dependence non-rejected children show in relationship with their parents.

$$r_{ps} = -.46. \text{ The fiducial limits are } +.18 \text{ and } -.18.$$

5. There is a relationship between sex and direction of aggression non-rejected children show toward authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$$r_{ps} = -.45. \text{ The fiducial limits are } +.18 \text{ and } -.18.$$

6. There is a relationship between sex and the amount of dependence non-rejected children show in relation to authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$$r_{ps} = -.41. \text{ The fiducial limits are } +.18 \text{ and } -.18.$$

The magnitudes of the correlations within their fiducial limits are such that no preferable relationships have been established between the sex of the non-rejected children and the behavior traits as measured here.

Hypothesis IV

1. There is a relationship between sex and the direction of aggression rejected children show with their peers.

$$r_{pb} = 0 + .011. \text{ The fiducial limits are } + .011 \text{ and } - .011.$$

2. There is a relationship between sex and the amount of integration rejected children show into a group of peers.

$$r_{pb} = 0 + .015. \text{ The fiducial limits are } + .015 \text{ and } - .015.$$

3. There is a relationship between sex and the direction of aggression rejected children show toward their parents.

$$r_{pb} = 0 + .011. \text{ The fiducial limits are } + .011 \text{ and } - .011.$$

4. There is a relationship between sex and the amount of dependence rejected children show in relationship with their parents.

$$r_{pb} = 0 + .017. \text{ The fiducial limits are } + .017 \text{ and } - .017.$$

5. There is a relationship between sex and the direction of aggression rejected children show toward authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$$r_{pb} = 0 + .015. \text{ The fiducial limits are } + .015 \text{ and } - .015.$$

6. There is a relationship between the amount of dependence rejected children show toward authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$$r_{pb} = 0 + .013. \text{ The fiducial limits are } + .013 \text{ and } - .013.$$

The magnitudes of the correlations within their fiducial limits are such that no predictable relationships have been established between the sex of the rejected children and the behavior traits as measured here. From the correlations obtained in Hypotheses III and IV, it may be concluded that the differences established between the

experimental and control groups are not due to the difference in the sex distribution between the two groups.

This study is not sensitive to sex differences. Consequently, these conclusions are not to be considered contradictory to the conclusions of previous studies which did find behavioral differences in rejected children due to sex (13, 14).

Another possible source of difference is in the factor of rejection - nonrejection. In the scale of rejection - non-rejection filled out by the children in the control group, 19 children are considered. Of these, 3 are rejected, 3 somewhat rejected, and the remaining mildly, little or not at all rejected (Table II). These six were eliminated from the computations. Of the experimental group, all are strongly rejected. It appears safe to attribute the differences between the experimental and control groups to the difference of feelings of rejection on the part of the mothers toward the children in the two groups, as the evidence indicates that they reject the children in the control group less than they do the children in the experimental group.

The relationship between the amount of dominance, passivity-passion, and ignoring in the maternal philosophy of child-rearing and the behavior traits in the children was investigated by determining the correlation of the scores the mother received on these traits with the behavior of the child in terms of the score the child received on the behavior rating scale. Each mother received a score on all three traits on the Fisher California Attitude Scale (See Appendix III). These scores were considered separately as one variable of a frequency

distributing the behavior of the child over the other variables. (Table 3 - 8C). The Pearson r was used to investigate this relationship.

Hypothesis 7c

1. There is a relationship between the amount of distance a mother has and the direction of aggression rejected children show when with their peers.

$r = +.49$. The statistical limits are $+ .31$ and $-.19$.

2. There is a relationship between the amount of distance a mother has and the amount of integration rejected children show into a group of peers.

$r = +.49$. The statistical limits are $+ .31$ and $-.19$.

3. There is a relationship between the amount of distance a mother has and the direction of aggression rejected children show toward their parents.

$r = +.49$. The statistical limits are $+ .31$ and $-.19$.

4. There is a relationship between the amount of distance a mother has and the amount of dependence rejected children show in relations with their parents.

$r = +.49$. The statistical limits are $+ .31$ and $-.19$.

5. There is a relationship between the amount of distance a mother has and the amount of aggression rejected children show towards authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$r = -.49$. The statistical limits are $+ .19$ and $-.71$.

6. There is a relationship between the amount of distance a mother has and the amount of dependence rejected children show in relation to authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$r = +.06$. The fiducial limits are $+ .28$ and $- .26$.

Hypothesis II:

1. There is a relationship between the degree of ignoring a mother has and the direction of aggression rejected children show them with their peers.

$r = -.15$. The fiducial limits are $+ .24$ and $- .34$.

2. There is a relationship between the degree of ignoring a mother has and the amount of integration rejected children show into a group of peers.

$r = +.07$. The fiducial limits are $+ .33$ and $- .19$.

3. There is a relationship between the degree of ignoring a mother has and the direction of aggression rejected children show toward their parents.

$r = +.07$. The fiducial limits are $+ .25$ and $+ .29$.

4. There is a relationship between the degree of ignoring a mother has and the amount of dependence rejected children show in relations with their parents.

$r = -.14$. The fiducial limits are $+ .23$ and $- .38$.

5. There is a relationship between the degree of ignoring the mother has and the amount of aggression the rejected children show toward authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$r = +.09$. The fiducial limits are $+ .24$ and $- .44$.

6. There is a relationship between the degree of ignoring the mother has and the amount of dependence rejected children show in relation to authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$r = +.26$. The fiducial limits are $+ .23$ and $- .20$.

Variables III:

1. There is a relationship between the amount of permissiveness a mother has and the direction of aggression rejected children show them with their peers.

$r = +.16$. The fiducial limits are $+ .16$ and $- .15$.

2. There is a relationship between the amount of permissiveness a mother has and the amount of integration rejected children show into a group of peers.

$r = -.08$. The fiducial limits are $+ .05$ and $- .07$.

3. There is a relationship between the amount of permissiveness a mother has and the direction of aggression rejected children show toward their parents.

$r = +.07$. The fiducial limits are $+ .23$ and $- .13$.

4. There is a relationship between the amount of permissiveness a mother has and the amount of dependence rejected children show in relation with their parents.

$r = +.17$. The fiducial limits are $+ .22$ and $- .05$.

5. There is a relationship between the amount of permissiveness a mother has and the amount of aggression rejected children show toward authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$r = -.13$. The fiducial limits are $+ .23$ and $- .13$.

6. There is a relationship between the amount of permissiveness a mother has and the amount of dependence rejected children show in relation to authoritarian figures other than their parents.

$r = +.17$. The fiducial limits are $+ .21$ and $- .07$.

The magnitude of the correlations with the Social Skills are such that no predictable relationships have been established between the amount of peerrejection, ignoring, and dominance, indicated by the scores on the California Attitudes Scale and the behavior patterns of rejected children as measured on the behavior rating scale.

It is quite clear that there is a significant difference in the direction of aggression, in the amount of dominance, and the amount of integration into a group of peers, between the experimental and control groups. It has been shown that this difference is not due to matting age or sex differences in the composition of the two groups.

It is concluded that a maternal attitude of rejection or non-rejection toward her child does influence the child's behavior as measured by the behavior rating scale. Where there is maternal rejection, the philosophy of child-rearing as stated by the mother can not be used for the prediction of the child's behavior. It may be inferred that within this sample of rejected children coming to the Santa County Child Detention Clinic, maternal feelings of rejection for a child are more important than maternal philosophies of child-rearing in determining the behavior patterns of the child.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

Results clearly indicate a difference between the experimental and control groups. It appears that this difference is due to the presence of a feeling of rejection toward children in the experimental groups and the absence of such a feeling of rejection toward the children who constitute the control group. This agrees with the conclusion of Sproule (21). The results further indicate that there is probably no relation between the stated philosophy of the mother in respect to distance, ignoring, and passiveness, and the behavior of the rejected children. These conclusions have implications in terms of some of the considerations previously mentioned. These implications are necessarily limited to rejected children who are patients in guidance clinics.

It may be concluded that the rejection most harm meaning to the rejected child the more into the clinic, inasmuch as it affects the behavior. To these children, it appears to be primary in affecting their behavior. On that basis it would appear that rejected children who come into the clinic should feel rejected. Examination of the clinical records reveal this to be so.

As is apparent to the reader, in cases of rejected children the maternal philosophy of child-rearing has little effect upon the child's behavior. Therefore, it would be important in treating mother's of

These cases do focus more upon the mother's feelings of rejection toward the child than upon the mother's philosophy of child-rearing. This would suggest that it would be important early in the determination of a case to the clinician to determine whether a feeling of rejection is present or not. It sometimes appears to the child that a feeling of rejection is present when there is considerable doubt as to whether or not it is really present. It would, therefore, appear that the information as to the presence or absence of rejection should be procured from the mother. Should the mother turn out to be rejecting, environmental manipulation of the home situation or superficial treatment of it would presumably be less effective than would handling the case on the feeling level. It appears possible that the actions of the mother toward the child under these circumstances would be less important than the feeling with which they perform these activities, and that it would be possible to change nothing within the family situation except the feeling and restore mental health and balance to the unit. This hypothesis warrants more detailed investigation and gives grounds of being a fruitful area for research.

It is often a custom in clinics to assume certain parental attitudes solely on the basis of the child's behavior patterns. The conclusion of this thesis would suggest that to diagnose the parent on this basis is a hazardous process and accurately should not be undertaken until the presence or absence of rejection is determined, and it may be a questionable practice even if rejection is not present. Further investigation is needed to determine this second point.

This presents an interesting problem in that the young child

Findings are extremely difficult to explain. This lack of ability suggests that a child reacts to his mother's feelings in terms of what they mean to him, and that although a child is sensitive to his mother's feelings, he may misinterpret them. This may be an explanation of a phenomenon noted by Lohrsta (11). The observations he and his co-workers made that rejection takes place without pathology being present would suggest that what looked like rejection to the observer may not appear as rejection to the child. It would further suggest that it affected the child's behavior only when the rejection was meaningful as such to the child.

The proposition that the child reacts to his mother's feelings in terms of the interpretation he places on them leads upon the question of the influence of the philosophy of child-rearing on the behavior of the child when the mother loves and rejects. It has only partial relevance, this study being a negative approach to this problem, but to the extent that it does touch on it, it would suggest that the philosophy of child-rearing is less important than the feeling. This hypothesis needs additional investigation.

Research by Bowlby (12, 13) and Harter (3) suggested that in rejected children there was a predictable pattern of pathology on the basis of the parent's philosophy of child-rearing. Their conclusion may be corroborated by the results of this study. The divergent conclusions of the two studies may be due to the different procedures used. Bowlby used the observed behavior of the parent as the independent variable rather than a statement of attitude as was done here.

The major finding of this study is that in rejected children

with pathology, it is the attitude of rejection and not the parental philosophy of child rearing that is the more important in determining the child's behavior.

The study conducted by Reed (18) is the one in the literature most pertinent to this study. He studies the effects of expressed parental attitude on the behavior of normal children. The attitudes he studied were in terms of the parent's expectations of their children. He found that the parent's expectations were not correlated with the behavior of their children, a conclusion that is similar to that of this dissertation. He secured the attitudes of the parent from the child, a limitation that severely limits the implications that can be drawn from his study. His study also differs from this one in that he did not study the parental philosophy of child rearing, but rather the parent's expectations of the child's behavior.

This study should not be considered contradictory to studies similar to Reed's which deal with behavior in the normal child, regardless of the conclusions of those studies. It is possible that where no rejection is present, the effects of desocialization, permissiveness, and ignoring may be different than they were found to be in this study.

As it is difficult to conceive that these philosophies be carried to an extreme without there being some pathology present in the parent or at least lack of positive feeling on the part of the parent for the child, it would appear advisable for future studies on the effects of these attitudes to partial out factors other than the philosophy. In this study, where rejection was controlled, it was found that this factor was more important than the degree of desocialization,

preconceptions, or ignoring present in the parents in his efforts on child behavior. This may be true of other factors on the setting of limits for the child; extreme projection of feelings on to the child, and not permitting the child to express himself.

Studies outlined here have suggested certain areas for investigation. Research along these lines could result in the development of new new instruments. It would appear on the basis of the results obtained that some of these new instruments should be developed along the dimensions of acceptance-rejection and other aspects of feeling in the area of parent-child relationships. Because of the directions of measuring behavior factors as compared to measuring emotional factors, the past tendency has been to focus upon behavioral manifestations in studying the interrelationship of parent and children. It would appear, however, that instruments oriented more toward tapping the emotional aspects of the relationship should prove quite fruitful.

This study differs in two respects from the previous studies reported, with the exception of Bandura's (19), 24) and Spence's (11), in that the children studied here in the experimental group were selected on the basis of behavior pathology and a clinical diagnosis of maternal rejection.

This study also differs from most prior studies in that it is a three-factor study rather than a two-factor study. Here both philosophy and feeling are considered in the method. In an attempt to determine the importance of philosophy of child-rearing, the investigator kept the feeling of rejection constant and used the maternal philosophy of child-rearing as an independent variable. For a

dependent variable, the child's behavior was used. This would support a variety of new procedures for investigation such as keeping parental philosophy constant and varying feelings, following the simple pattern used here with normal children, and in other variations of this basic theme.

The next viable area that suggests itself for exploration is the ability of the child to differentiate between the maternal feeling and the maternal philosophy of child-rearing. Investigation of this area appears to be needed rather badly, as does another aspect of the question, viz.: What is the difference between the maternal philosophy of child-rearing and the mother's feeling for the child? This problem has implications in terms of the change in sensitivity to feelings of others that appears to come with maturity.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Fifty-nine rejected children and their mothers were chosen for the purpose of investigating the relationship of maternal philosophy of childrearing to certain aspects of the child's behavior. The cases were selected from accepted clinic cases in Dade County, Florida.

These children ranged in age from 5 to 12 and were all cases seen in the clinic with non-psychotic behavior pathology. All cases chosen were of white ancestry, lived in an American culture, came from the middle or upper-lower socio-economic group, lived with their parents or at least their true mother and a stepfather, and lived at home. Cases were excluded that did not meet these criteria, or who had brain damage, or who had other authoritative figures living in the home. One brother or sister of each of the children in this group was selected from those cases where a sibling was present and not rejected. These siblings constituted a control group and they fit the same criteria as the experimental group with few exceptions. These exceptions were that the children in the control group were not rejected and were not clinic cases.

The maternal philosophy was determined by the California Parental Attitude Scale. The children's behavior was rated on a scale devised by the author. Tapes were analyzed for the differences

between the experimental and control group, which difference was significant. This suggested that the presence or absence of a feeling of rejection on the part of the mother was of great importance in determining the presence or absence of behavior pathology in the children studied.

There behavior pathology was present as predictable relationship was found between the degree of maternal philosophy and the behavior of the rejected children. This suggests the noted behavior of the rejected children used in this study was determined essentially on the basis of the feeling of rejection that the mother had more than upon the mother's philosophy of child-rearing, insofar as these factors affected their behavior.

The general conclusions are that when behavior pathology is present in rejected children the case is the clinic, it is more related to the mother's feeling of rejection for the child than the mother's philosophy of child-rearing and that within the limited area studied the pattern of behavior of the rejected child with behavior pathology does not predictably vary with the maternal philosophy toward child-rearing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anderson, J. P., A study of the relationships between certain aspects of parental behavior and the attitudes of Junior High School pupils, Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 100.
2. Baldwin, L., Kellars, Jean, and Brown, Fay, Relations of parent behavior, Psychological Monographs, 1940, No. 20, (whole No. 261).
3. Barnes, Dorothy, The study of tension in inter-parental relationship as co-related with behavior adjustment in young children, Journal of Experimental Education, 1931, 4, 187-204.
4. Campsey, E. C., Measurement of parental behavior, Child Development, 1944, 15, 135-154.
5. Christensen, Marion J., Relations of certain aspects of parent behavior and behavior of Junior High School pupils, Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 107.
6. Florell, E. C., Psychosomatic study of the family, New York: International Library, 1931.
7. Freud, S., Contributions to the theory of sex, Psychoanalytische Studien, 1903, 86-88.
8. Kottelat, E. P., Interrelations between the pre-school child's behavior and certain factors in the home, Child Development, 1934, 5, 200-201.
9. Kanner, L., Child Psychiatry, (Second Edition), Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1943, p. 117.
10. Levy, L., The depressed and isolated forms of psychopathic personalities, American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1931, 17, 279-294.
11. Levy, L., Emotional introversion, New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.
12. Mollison, E. P., Behavior of parents of subnormal, neurotic, and normal children, American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1930, 16, 177-179.

13. Sewell, R. V., The psychodynamics of maternal rejection, American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1934, 4, 344-351.
14. Sewell, R. V., A further study of maternal rejection, American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1934, 4, 367-373.
15. Pearson, T. J., Statistical Methods of Education, New York: N. Y. Norton and Co., 1947, p. 71.
16. Pratt, C. F., and White, Mary Ellen, Contrasted study of the personality relationships of mothers of male schizophrenic patients, American Journal of Psychiatry, 1935, 107, 453-454.
17. Rado, R. A., Psychical experience and child behavior, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1946.
18. Rado, R. A., Parental expressed attitudes and children's behavior, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1946, 3, 75-80.
19. Rapp, E., Is reeling of the knee muscular paralysis?, Journal of Educational Psychology, 1931, 12, 176-178.
20. Rado, R. A., Jr., Assessment of parental attitudes in relation to child adjustment, Journal Psychology Monographs, 1947, 101-117.
21. Rylands, F., Study of parental acceptance and rejection, American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1934, 4, 3, pp. 477-481.
22. Spitzgoff, Ruth, Recent approaches to the study of the preoccupied child, III, Influence of parental attitudes on child behavior, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1938, 3, 34-36.
23. Van Haterum, Dorothy, A new scale for rating behavior and attitudes in elementary schools, Journal of Educational Psychology, 1934, 27, 477-479.
24. Warner, V. L., Madow, H., and Ball, E., Social classes in America, Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1947.
25. Young, E., Personality and problems of adjustment, New York: Appleton-Century, 1944, p. 124.

Appendix I

Table

TABLE 1
SCALES ON THE CALIFORNIA ATTITUDE SCALE

Case No.	Subject's Score			Subject's Score			Case Classif.
	Political	Religious	Economic	Political	Religious	Economic	
1	160	161	159	160	174	173	2
2	150	161	159	163	179	159	2
3	154	161	153	167	169	156	2
4	166	167	154	166	167	160	2
5	161	163	165	None			2
6	151	165	166	167	156	169	2
7	175	166	168	176	171	158	2
8	156	166	153	175	179	165	2
9	169	163	166	156	166	171	2
10	160	166	170	166	166	156	2
11	166	167	166	167	166	166	2
12	154	166	153	166	167	159	2
13	157	166	168	163	166	166	2
14	161	170	166	165	166	159	1
15	156	167	175	159	165	163	1
16	150	166	177	151	166	166	1
17	156	169	166	None			1
18	166	167	165	163	160	156	1
19	163	167	166	166	176	166	1

Table 2 — (Continued)

Case No.	Petitioner's Income			Respondent's Income			Case Classification
	Paternal	Maternal	Spousal	Paternal	Maternal	Spousal	
86	131	140	140	131	139	139	I
87	147	159	179	157	167	168	I
88	136	136	163	136	135	135	I
89	137	136	156	None			I
90	139	147	173	139	179	136	I
91	156	168	189	163	179	173	P
92	139	167	189	167	160	163	P
93	159	166	179	156	113	89	P
94	183	163	163	None			P
95	179	163	163	None			P
96	167	159	167	None			P
97	171	167	169	160	146	165	P
98	173	166	156	169	166	165	P
99	166	179	165	None			P
100	163	165	139	None			P
101	189	189	173	176	167	119	B
102	166	166	139	166	169	169	B
103	156	166	167	None			B
104	171	139	169	160	163	166	B
105	163	168	165	None			B
106	160	163	173	None			C
107	167	169	171	163	161	136	C
108	169	173	167	None			P

TABLE 1 — Continued

Case No.	Mother's Score			Father's Score			Case Classified
	Parental	Individual	Spontaneous	Parental	Individual	Spontaneous	
43	182	171	183	161	170	166	F
44	176	166	185	167	166	180	F
45	178	168	186	172	167	189	F
46	161	169	161	None			I
47	160	145	205	167	171	166	I
48	145	143	207	None			F
49	155	160	171	159	166	176	I
50	173	176	163	167	166	169	F
51	156	170	170	157	157	161	F
52	177	156	147	None			F
53	160	145	162	None			I
54	171	177	146	171	162	165	F
55	163	165	169	None			I
56	169	160	162	165	166	167	F
57	165	166	119	170	173	169	F
58	158	173	166	None			I
59	166	166	149	163	169	169	F

TABLE I
CLASSIFICATION OF GROUPS MEMBERS

Role	Aggression
	1. Aggressive
	2. Highly Aggressive
	3. Balanced Relations
	4. Mild Withdrawal
	5. Withdrawn
	<u>Dependence</u>
	1. Highly Dependent
	2. Dependent
	3. Balanced Relations
	4. Independent
	5. Extreme Independence
	<u>Group Identification</u>
	1. Leader of Group
	2. Member of Group
	3. Follower in Group
	4. Strained to Group
	5. Outside Group

TABLE I — Continued
 Experimental Group

Case No.	Sex	Aggression Authority	Parent	Dependent Authority	Parent	Group Designation	Sex	Age
1	M	1	1	0	0	0	M	9
2	M	0	1-5	1	1	3	M	10
3	M	1-5	0	0	1-5	5	M	11
4	M	4	4	4	0	4	M	9
5	M-5	3	0	0	1	4	F	9
6	M	0	1	4	4	4	M	0
7	M	3	4	3	0	0	F	9
8	M	0	0	1	2	4	M	9
9	M	4	4	0	0	3	M	10
10	M	0	1	0	0	3	M	10
11	M	4	4	0	0	4	M	10
12	M	0	1-5	0	0	3	M	7
13	M	0	1	0	1	0	M	0
14	M	0	0	4	4	0	M	0
15	M	0	3	0	4	0	F	11
16	M	0	0	0	1	1-5	M	9
17	M	1-5	0	1-5	0	0	F	11
18	M	1	0	4	0	3	M	11
19	M-5	3	1-5	0	0	1-5	M	0
20	M	0	0	0	0	0	F	0
21	F	3	5	3	0	5	F	9
22	M	3	0	1	0	1-5	M	9

TABLE 2 — (Continued)

Case No.	Year	Intensive Activity	Parent	Spontaneous Activity	Parent	Group Integration	Sex	Age
23	4	4	4	0	0	4	M	21
24	1	1	1	4	4	4	M	9
25	2	2	2	0	0	5	F	20
26	0	3	0	1	1	3	F	7
27	1.5	4	0	1	0	4.5	M	20
28	1	1	1	0	0	0	M	7
29	4.5	1	1.5	4.5	4	5	M	0
30	1	1	1	5	5	5	M	20
31	1	1	1	1	1.5	4	M	17
32	1	0	0	4	4	4	M	21
33	1.5	4	4	1	1	6.5	F	21
34	4	0	0	0	0	4.5	M	10
35	4	4	4	4	1.5	5	F	0
36	0	3	4.5	1	1	1	M	10
37	1	4	4	3	4	5	M	9
38	4	0	1	4	4	5	F	10
39	0	3	1	0	0	4	F	9
40	1	0	1	0	0	4	M	10
41	3	0	1	1	1	0	F	0
42	3	0	0	0	0	0	M	10
43	5	4	4	0	0	5	M	21
44	1.5	1.5	1	1	0	0	M	9
45	4	4	0	4	4	3	F	10

TABLE 2 -- Continued

Case No.	Sex	Aggression		Dependence		Group		Age
		Authority	Parent	Authority	Parent	Integration	Sex	
46	A	A	B	B	A	B	M	20
47	F	B	B	B	A	B	M	18
48	A	B	B	B	B	B	M	20
49	A	B	B	B	B	A	M	9
50	B	A-B	B	A-B	A	B	M	23
51	B	B	A	A	A	A	M	21
52	B	B	B	B	A	B	F	9
53	B	B	B	B	A	B	M	7
54	B	B	A	B	A	B	M	7
55	B	B	B	B	B	A	M	20
56	B	A	B	A	B	A	M	18
57	B	B	B	B	A	A	M	18
58	B	B	B	B	B	A	M	18
59	A-B	A-B	B	A	B	A-B	F	8

CONTROL GROUP

6	B	B	B	B	B	B	F	4
9*	B	B	B	A	A	A	M	12
10	B	B	B	B	B	B	F	5
12	B	B	B	A	A	B	M	13
14	A	B	B	B	B	B	F	6
16	B	B	B	B	B	B	F	10
17	B	B	B	A	B	B	F	4

* Control cases who were not used in the comparisons because maternal rejection was present.

TABLE 2 — (Continued)

Case No.	Sex	Aggression		Dependence		Group Interrelation	Sex	Age
		Authority	Parent	Authority	Parent			
21	3	3	3	3	3	4	M	14
22	4	4	3	3	3	3	M	12
23	3	3	3	4	3	3	F	12
24	3	3	3	3	3	4	M	13
27*	3	3	3	3	3	3	M	13
28	3	3	3	3	3	3	M	20
29	3	3	3	3	4	3	M	13
30	3	3	3	3	3	3	M	8
32	4	3	3	3	3	3	F	7
34	3	3	3	3	3	3	F	13
37	3	3	3	4	4	3	M	7
42	3	4	3	4	4	3	M	6
43	3	3	3	3	3	3	F	10
44*	3	3	3	3	4	3	M	7
45	3	3	3	3	3	3	M	6
48	3	3	3	3	3	3	M	9
49*	3	3	3	3	3	3	F	6
49	4	3	3	3	3	3	M	7
50	3	3	3	3	3	3	F	20
52*	3	3	3	4	3	3	M	6
53	4,5	3	3	3	4	3	M	7
55*	3	3	3	3	3	3	M	15

* Control cases who were not used in the computations because internal rejection was present.

TABLE 3
PARENTS' SCORES
ADJUSTED TO ATTEND

Attitude	Child's Behavior Rating				
	$I_a = I_aP$	$I_b = I_bP$	$I_c = I_cP$	$I_d = I_dP$	$I_e = I_eP$
179.5-179.5	0	0	0	1	0
179.5-179.5	0	1	0	1	0
179.5-179.5	3	1	1	0	0
179.5-179.5	2	2	3	1	0
179.5-179.5	0	3	1	0	0
179.5-179.5	2	3	1	3	0
179.5-179.5	0	5	3	2	0
179.5-179.5	1	1	0	1	0

TABLE 4
 RECOMMENDED BOND
 INCREASE TO FIRM

Firm Size Index	Capital's Leverage Ratio				
	$L_1 = L_0$	$L_1 = 0.5$	$L_1 = 0.3$	$L_1 = 0.2$	$L_1 = 0.1$
100.0-120.0	1	0	1	0	0
120.0-140.0	1	1	1	1	1
140.0-160.0	3	0	0	2	0
160.0-180.0	3	1	1	3	0
180.0-200.0	5	1	2	2	0
200.0-220.0	7	2	1	4	0
220.0-240.0	7	2	0	3	0
240.0-260.0	1	0	0	2	0

TABLE 3
PARASITICIDAL SCORE
ADDITION TO SCORE

Parasite Score	Dunn's Resection Rating				
	1. - 1.9	2. - 2.9	3. - 3.9	4. - 4.9	5. - 5.9
100.5-109.5	1	1	0	0	0
109.5-119.5	0	1	0	3	0
119.5-129.5	3	1	0	1	0
129.5-139.5	1	5	0	1	1
139.5-149.5	4	4	0	0	0
149.5-159.5	5	7	0	3	0
159.5-169.5	4	7	0	1	0
169.5-179.5	1	1	0	1	0

TABLE 6
 PUNISHMENT AND
 GROUP INTERACTION

APPL-444 Group	Child's Behavior Rating				
	$I_a = I_aP$	$I_b = I_bP$	$I_c = I_cP$	$I_d = I_dP$	$I_e = I_eP$
189.5-279.5	0	1	0	0	1
279.5-379.5	0	1	0	0	4
379.5-479.5	0	2	0	2	1
479.5-579.5	0	1	1	1	5
579.5-679.5	0	3	2	4	1
679.5-779.5	1	2	1	7	3
779.5-879.5	1	2	5	2	2
879.5-979.5	0	0	0	2	1

TABLE 7
POLYMERIZATION OF
INITIATORS ON POLYST

Initiator dose	Grafting Ratio, %				
	$I_1 = I_0/2$	$I_2 = I_0/4$	$I_3 = I_0/8$	$I_4 = I_0/16$	$I_5 = I_0/32$
100.5-4.75.5	0	2	0	0	0
179.5-4.63.5	0	3	0	0	0
169.5-4.75.5	1	2	0	2	0
179.5-4.63.5	3	3	0	1	1
169.5-4.75.5	5	3	0	2	0
179.5-4.63.5	4	12	0	0	0
189.5-4.59.5	3	4	0	4	1
129.5-4.89.5	0	2	0	1	0

TABLE 8
PERCENTAGES OF
DEPENDENCE ON ACTIVITY

Attitude Score	Dobson's Rotarod Test ^a				
	1. = 1.7	2. = 2.3	3. = 3.9	4. = 4.7	5. = 5.3
169.5-179.5	0	0	0	0	0
179.5-189.5	3	0	0	0	0
189.5-199.5	0	0	1	0	0
199.5-209.5	0	3	1	1	1
209.5-219.5	3	5	0	0	0
219.5-229.5	3	3	0	0	0
229.5-239.5	0	5	0	3	0
239.5-249.5	0	1	0	0	0

TABLE 7
NO-TRACE FORM
FIRST ITERATION

Attribute Score	Cellula Operator Action				
	$L = L_1$	$R = R_1$	$L = L_2$	$L = L_3$	$R = R_2$
100.5-200.5	0	0	0	0	0
100.5-200.5	0	0	1	1	1
100.5-200.5	0	1	0	0	1
100.5-200.5	0	0	1	7	1
100.5-200.5	1	1	1	7	1
100.5-200.5	0	1	1	1	1
100.5-200.5	1	0	0	0	1
100.5-200.5	0	0	1	0	0

TABLE 10
 RICHARD ROSE
 IMPROVED CL ACTIVITY

Catalytic Series	Catalytic Reactions Series				
	1. = 1,2	2. = 2,3	3. = 3,4	4. = 4,5	5. = 5,6
100,5-100,5	0	0	0	0	0
100,5-100,5	1	3	1	0	0
100,5-100,5	1	3	0	3	0
100,5-100,5	1	4	1	0	0
100,5-100,5	1	7	3	3	1
100,5-100,5	0	7	1	3	0
100,5-100,5	1	0	0	1	0
100,5-100,5	1	1	0	0	0

TABLE 12.
 JOHNSON'S SCORE
 APPROXIMATION TO T-TEST

Amplitude Score	Gull's Behavior Rating				
	$T_1 = 1.0$	$T_2 = 1.5$	$T_3 = 2.0$	$T_4 = 2.5$	$T_5 = 3.0$
100.5-200.5	0	0	0	0	0
100.5-200.5	1	0	0	1	0
100.5-200.5	3	1	2	0	1
100.5-200.5	7	2	0	1	0
100.5-200.5	20	2	2	2	0
100.5-200.5	6	1	2	1	0
100.5-200.5	1	0	0	1	0
100.5-200.5	0	1	0	1	0

TABLE 11
 INCUBATION PERIOD
 ADDITION TO HATCHING

Avifauna Group	Incubation Period, Days				
	$1_1 = 1.7$	$1_2 = 2.7$	$1_3 = 3.7$	$1_4 = 4.7$	$1_5 = 5.7$
101.5-119.5	0	0	0	0	0
119.5-139.5	0	1	0	0	0
139.5-159.5	1	3	1	0	0
159.5-179.5	3	7	0	1	0
179.5-199.5	5	7	4	1	0
199.5-219.5	3	5	1	4	0
219.5-239.5	0	1	1	0	0
239.5-259.5	0	0	1	1	0

TABLE 2)
 DOMINANCE SCORE
 ADDITION TO RANKING

Stations	GILLNET's Secondary Ranking				
	$2_1 = 1,5$	$2_2 = 2,8$	$2_3 = 3,5$	$4_1 = 4,5$	$5_1 = 5,8$
127,5-129,5	0	0	0	0	0
179,5-181,5	1	1	0	3	0
189,5-191,5	1	3	1	0	0
229,5-231,5	0	0	0	1	0
269,5-271,5	7	7	1	1	1
279,5-281,5	3	0	0	2	0
329,5-331,5	1	1	0	0	0
329,5-331,5	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 14
 EXCHANGE RATE
 INFORMATION ON POLAND

Date	2002-2003 Exchange Rates				
	$z_t = z_{t-1}$	$z_t = z_{t-1}$	$z_t = z_{t-1}$	$z_t = z_{t-1}$	$z_t = z_{t-1}$
2002.5-2003.5	0	0	0	0	0
2003.5-2004.5	0	3	0	0	0
2004.5-2005.5	0	3	0	0	0
2005.5-2006.5	4	7	0	0	0
2006.5-2007.5	5	0	0	0	0
2007.5-2008.5	0	0	0	3	0
2008.5-2009.5	0	1	0	1	0
2009.5-2010.5	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 16
 LEARNING SCORE
 GROUP INTERACTION

Attitude Score	Child's Behavior Score				
	$I_1 = I_1F$	$I_2 = I_2F$	$I_3 = I_3F$	$I_4 = I_4F$	$I_5 = I_5F$
100.5-119.5	0	1	0	1	0
120.5-139.5	0	2	3	2	1
140.5-159.5	1	1	1	3	2
160.5-179.5	0	7	2	0	3
180.5-199.5	1	0	2	3	1
200.5-219.5	0	0	3	5	1
220.5-239.5	1	1	1	3	2
240.5-259.5	0	0	2	0	2

TABLE 14
 JOINTING CODE
 EXPECTED BY ALPHABET

Plaintiff's Code	Defendant's Relating Tables				
	$L_1 = L_1, P$	$L_1 = L_1, T$	$L_1 = L_1, F$	$L_1 = L_1, S$	$L_1 = L_1, B$
100,0-100,0	0	0	0	0	0
170,0-100,0	1	0	0	1	0
100,0-170,0	0	1	1	0	0
170,0-170,0	0	1	1	1	0
100,0-100,0	1	0	1	1	1
170,0-100,0	1	1	1	0	0
100,0-170,0	0	1	0	0	0
170,0-170,0	1	1	1	1	0

TABLE 12
 DIRECTION SCORES
 ASSIGNED TO ATTITUDE

Attitude	Gullik's Behavior Rating				
	$1_a + 1_b$	$2_a + 2_b$	$3_a + 3_b$	$4_a + 4_b$	$5_a + 5_b$
100.5-109.5	0	1	1	0	0
109.5-119.5	0	2	3	0	0
119.5-129.5	1	5	8	8	0
129.5-139.5	3	5	8	3	1
139.5-149.5	8	1	8	8	0
149.5-159.5	3	4	0	8	0
159.5-169.5	8	5	1	0	0
169.5-179.5	0	1	1	8	0

TABLE 12
 Students' scores
 according to gender

Article	Student's Behavior Rating				
	$1_n - 1_n?$	$2_n - 2_n?$	$3_n - 3_n?$	$4_n - 4_n?$	$5_n - 5_n?$
10%,5-20%,5	0	2	0	0	0
15%,5-20%,5	1	4	0	0	0
20%,5-20%,5	4	0	1	1	1
10%,5-30%,5	0	0	1	3	0
15%,5-20%,5	3	2	0	0	0
15%,5-25%,5	3	4	0	0	0
15%,5-25%,5	3	5	0	0	0
15%,5-25%,5	0	3	0	1	0

TABLE 17
 MISSING FROM
 DEPENDENCE OF PARENTS

Mileage	Dad's Behavior Rating				
	1. = 1.0	2. = 2.0	3. = 3.0	4. = 4.0	5. = 5.0
101.5-109.5	0	2	0	0	0
111.5-119.5	1	3	0	1	0
121.5-129.5	4	5	0	2	0
131.5-139.5	6	7	0	1	0
141.5-149.5	0	6	0	0	1
151.5-159.5	3	3	0	3	0
161.5-169.5	2	3	0	3	0
171.5-179.5	1	1	0	2	0

TABLE 20
 IMPRIS: BORN
 APPROXIMATE TO FEMALE

GRADE Score	Child's Behavior Rating				
	$I_1 = I_1^0$	$I_1 = I_1^0$	$I_2 = I_2^0$	$I_2 = I_2^0$	$I_2 = I_2^0$
107.5-109.5	2	0	0	1	0
117.5-119.5	3	2	1	0	0
125.5-127.5	4	1	3	2	0
135.5-137.5	6	1	2	4	2
145.5-147.5	4	2	0	2	0
155.5-157.5	6	0	0	3	0
165.5-167.5	3	2	0	3	0
175.5-177.5	1	1	0	2	0

TABLE 12
SCORES ON THE REJECTION
RATIO SCALE

Control Group (N=100)	Relay
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10
11	11
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
26	26
27	27
28	28
29	29
30	30
31	31
32	32
33	33
34	34
35	35
36	36
37	37
38	38
39	39
40	40
41	41
42	42
43	43
44	44
45	45
46	46
47	47
48	48
49	49
50	50
51	51
52	52
53	53
54	54
55	55
56	56
57	57
58	58
59	59
60	60
61	61
62	62
63	63
64	64
65	65
66	66
67	67
68	68
69	69
70	70
71	71
72	72
73	73
74	74
75	75
76	76
77	77
78	78
79	79
80	80
81	81
82	82
83	83
84	84
85	85
86	86
87	87
88	88
89	89
90	90
91	91
92	92
93	93
94	94
95	95
96	96
97	97
98	98
99	99
100	100

100

1. Very rejected
2. Some rejection
3. Little rejection
4. No rejection

APPENDIX 10

SACRAMENTO PARTIAL AFTERSHOCK SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS: Read each question carefully, then place the number corresponding closest to your feelings about each question in the scoring column on the right margin.

1 - Strong agreement with the statement

2 - Mild agreement with the statement

3 - Mild disagreement with the statement

4 - Strong disagreement with the statement

1. A child should be seen and not heard_____
2. Parents should sacrifice everything for their children_____
3. A child should be required to consult his parent before making any kind of decision_____
4. Children need to have some of the natural freedom taken out of them_____
5. A child should have strict discipline in order to develop a firm, strong character_____
6. The Mother rather than the Father should be responsible for discipline_____
7. Children should be "battered" until they are several years old_____
8. Children have the right to play with whomver they like_____
9. Independent and mature children are less lovable than those children who openly and obviously need and need their parents_____
10. Children should be forbidden to play with those persons whom their parents do not approve of_____
11. A good way to discipline a child is to tell him that his parents won't love him any more if he is bad_____
12. Severe discipline is essential in the training of children_____
13. Parents cannot help at all if their children are naughty_____

26. Jealousy among brothers and sisters is a very unhealthy thing_____
27. Children should be allowed to go to any Sunday School their friends go to_____
28. No child should ever set his will against that of his parents_____
29. The husband cannot say children must obey their parents should be completely subject to_____
30. It is wrong for children to disobey their parents_____
31. A child should feel a deep sense of obligation to act in accord with the wishes of his parents_____
32. Children should not be punished for disobedience_____
33. Children who are gentlemanly or ladylike are preferable to those who are boisterous or "rougher ones"_____
34. Proper discipline makes a child's personality_____
35. Children should always be loyal to their parents above anyone else_____
36. Children should be steered away from the temptations of religious beliefs other than those accepted by the family_____
37. The steering of a child from the maternal side to the paternal begins at birth_____
38. Parents are not entitled to the love of their children unless they earn it_____
39. Parents should never try to break a child's will_____
40. Children should not be required to take orders from parents_____
41. Children should be allowed to choose their own religious beliefs_____
42. Children should not interrupt adult conversation_____
43. The most important consideration in planning the activities of the home should be the needs and interests of the children_____

14. Other children are older than little children_____
15. It is sometimes necessary to break the child's will_____
16. Children usually know ahead of time whether or not parents will punish them for their actions_____
17. Children resist discipline_____
18. Children should not be permitted to play with weapons from the "wrong side of the track"_____
19. When the parent speaks, the child should obey_____
20. Mild discipline is best_____
21. The best child is one who shows lots of affection for his father_____
22. A child should be taught that his parents always know what is best_____
23. It is better for children to play at home than to visit other children_____
24. Most children should have more discipline than they get_____
25. A child should do what he is told without stopping to argue about it_____
26. Children should fear parents to some degree_____
27. A child should love his parents above everyone else_____
28. Children who behave in bad play become adult sinners_____
29. Children should be allowed to make only small decisions for themselves_____
30. A child should accept the decision of his parents_____
31. Children who readily accept authority are much closer than those who try to be defiant themselves_____
32. Parents should always have complete control over the actions of their children_____
33. When they can't have their own way, children usually try to bargain or reason with parents_____

52. The shy child is worse off than one who contradicts_____
53. Children should accept the religion of their parents without question_____
54. The child should not question the parents of his parents_____
55. Children who fight with their brothers and sisters are generally a source of great irritation and annoyance to their parents_____
56. Children should not be punished for anything that they have seen their parents do_____
57. Jealousy is just a sign of selfishness_____
58. Children should be taught the value of money early_____
59. A child should be punished for contradicting his parents_____
60. Children should have lots of parental supervision_____
61. A parent should see to it that his child plays only with the right kind of children_____
62. Babies are more fun for parents than older children_____
63. Parents should supervise a child's selection of playmates very carefully_____
64. No one should expect a child to mind parents who nag and scold_____
65. A child should always believe what his parents tell him_____
66. Children should usually be allowed to have their own way_____
67. A good way to discipline a child is to not show his affection_____
68. Children should not be teased or jested into challenges_____
69. A child should be shown late challenges if he won't listen to reason_____
70. In the long run it is better, after all, for a child to be kept fairly close to his father's open strings_____

71. A good whipping now and then never hurt my child_____
72. Interference is the worst bad habit that a child can form_____
73. A child should never keep a secret from his parents_____
74. Parents are generally too busy to answer all a child's questions_____
75. The children who make the best adults are those who stay all the time_____
76. It is important for children to have some kind of religious upbringing_____
77. Children should be allowed to manage their own affairs with little supervision from adults_____
78. Parents should never enter a child's room without permission_____
79. It is best to give children the impression that adults have no faults_____
80. Children should not annoy their parents with unimportant problems_____
81. Children should give their parents unquestioning obedience_____
82. Sex is one of the greatest problems to be confronted with in children_____
83. Children should have as much freedom as parents allow themselves_____
84. Children should do nothing without the consent of their parents_____

APPENDIX XXI

CHANGING RIVER BEDS

RELATIONSHIP WITH GROUP

DATE: _____ RACE: _____

RELATIONSHIP TO PERSON:

Aggression	WGA Aggression	Good	WGA Withdrawn	Deviation
------------	-------------------	------	------------------	-----------

Member of Group	Member of Group	Follows in Group	Attended to Group	Spoke Group
--------------------	--------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------

RELATIONSHIP TO PERSON: (CHECK BOTH SCALES)

Aggression	WGA Aggression	Good	WGA Withdrawn	Deviation
------------	-------------------	------	------------------	-----------

Highly Dependent	Dependent	Balance Relationship	Independent	Extreme Independence
---------------------	-----------	-------------------------	-------------	-------------------------

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ACTIVITY GROUPS:

Aggression	WGA Aggression	Good	WGA Withdrawn	Deviation
------------	-------------------	------	------------------	-----------

Highly Dependent	Dependent	Balance Relationship	Independent	Extreme Independence
---------------------	-----------	-------------------------	-------------	-------------------------

APPENDIX IV

THE AIRPORT HOUSE

Name: _____ Grade: _____

Subject: _____

Instructions: Please check the appropriate description for each activity group, for the pupil indicated, on the basis of your observation. This is for a research study being carried out by the Child Guidance Clinic and does not indicate the presence of any pathology in these children, as most of them are in a control group.

I. When taking turns with apparatus or materials in group situations.

- _____ Takes patiently for turn.
- _____ Takes turn willingly.
- _____ Makes occasional reminder to be patient.
- _____ Is too impatient--does not wait at all.
- _____ Is impatient while waiting turn.
- _____ Is unwilling to wait turn.
- _____ Is unwilling to wait turn and interferes with other children's activities.

II. When there is a group project to be carried out.

- _____ Enjoys cooperating with others to improve the group work.
- _____ Cooperates willingly with others.
- _____ Is slow to cooperate.
- _____ Does not cooperate with the group.
- _____ Withdraws from group activity and works on non-relevant activity.
- _____ Distorts group activity.

III. When faced with a social situation involving sacrifice of one interest or needs to those of the group.

- _____ Feels group needs before own needs
- _____ Helps group when own work is done satisfactorily
- _____ Does own work before attending to schoolroom jobs or helping other children
- _____ Gives time and thought to others instead of own satisfactions
- _____ Follows own interests
- _____ Values only of own immediate satisfaction
- _____ Follows own interests to the point of disturbing the group

IV. Emotional tone in school.

- _____ Is happy and not easily distressed, enjoys work as much as play
- _____ Shows even, cheerful disposition—in calm
- _____ Does not show an unusual amount of change of mood
- _____ Is care-free and carelessness
- _____ Does not take things seriously enough
- _____ Shows extreme amount of changeableness in mood
- _____ Is moody and irritable

V. When there is a chance to go to school for help or approval.

- _____ Shows satisfaction in his own ability—not depending on adult approval
- _____ Shows satisfaction in own ability but needs some adult approval
- _____ Does not seem to get satisfaction in his own ability or to recognize it without adult approval
- _____ Hides for approval—for example, shows work to adult for praise
- _____ Lets only when adult gives approval or help
- _____ Hides for help (notes, notes, complaints, stalling, etc.) until he realizes help is not forthcoming

VI. When faced with failure.

- ☐ Does none of failure and tries to correct it
- ☐ Tries to get help to overcome difficulty
- ☐ Moves quickly and plans new activity
- ☐ Shows disappointment, and continues activity
- ☐ Is apparently indifferent to failure
- ☐ Becomes discouraged easily--does succeed in order to continue activity
- ☐ Becomes irritable or angry or cries

VII. When child has the opportunity to take responsibility for a group task.

- ☐ Directs task and carries it to completion for benefit of group
- ☐ Takes responsibility for task without being requested of it
- ☐ Takes a task not done and completes it
- ☐ Takes responsibility for task only when especially asked by teacher
- ☐ Takes responsibility for task only when special interest is involved
- ☐ Rarely wants to take charge of task
- ☐ Cannot take responsibility for a group task

VIII. When in a social situation which allows for initiative.

- ☐ Can organize and lead a large group
- ☐ Can organize and lead a small group
- ☐ Can lead another child
- ☐ Takes good care of self and does and attempts to lead others
- ☐ Does not like to have others take the lead and always to own ideas
- ☐ Behaves other children or horses than

_____ Allows other children to tease him in a way that is harmful to himself or others

_____ Shows cruel tendencies, such as bullying, ridiculing, etc.

_____ Flaps alone

_____ Shows no social initiative

III. When he can get help from an adult

_____ Tries hard by himself before he will ask for help or when one phrase--does not need help

_____ Asks only for necessary help

_____ Requests to ask for help when he really needs it

_____ Depends upon help being given

_____ Asks unnecessarily for help

_____ Helps self only when being urged

APPENDIX F

EXHIBIT F-1

Case History

Notes

Date

On the basis of the following criteria please rate the attitude of the parent to the above named child toward this child.

- | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----------|----|---------|
| 1) Does the mother protect child to excess | Yes | Sometimes | No | Unknown |
| 2) Does the mother neglect child | Yes | Sometimes | No | Unknown |
| 3) Does the mother say of child | Yes | Sometimes | No | Unknown |
| 4) Is the mother indifferent to child | Yes | Sometimes | No | Unknown |
| 5) Does she threaten to send child away | Yes | Sometimes | No | Unknown |
| 6) Is excessively irritated with child | Yes | Sometimes | No | Unknown |
| 7) Is her handling of child inconsistent | Yes | Sometimes | No | Unknown |
| 8) Is she suspicious of child | Yes | Sometimes | No | Unknown |
| 9) Does she reward spending money on child | Yes | Sometimes | No | Unknown |
| 10) Does she compare child unfavorably with
a sibling | Yes | Sometimes | No | Unknown |

You rate the mother's feeling of rejection toward this child, on you use 0-4, on the following scale.

Very	Some	Slight	Little	None
------	------	--------	--------	------

NOTE: Please fill out this rating in terms of parent's feeling at time she first came to the clinic.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFO

Richard S. Greenbaum was born in Brooklyn, New York, on October 26, 1924. He began undergraduate studies in Brooklyn College in New York in 1941. These studies were interrupted for military service with the United States Army, Corps of Engineers, in 1944. He resumed his college career at the University of Maryland following his discharge from service in 1945. He received his Bachelor of Arts degree in August, 1947.

He started graduate work in psychology at the University of Maryland in September, 1947 and received his Master of Science degree in February, 1948.

His graduate studies were continued at the University of Tennessee for one year until they were interrupted for personal reasons.

In September, 1951, he returned to graduate work at the University of Florida where he remained a student until February, 1953, when he accepted a position as clinical psychologist with the Duval County Child Guidance Clinic. He is currently employed in this clinic.

He is a member of the American Psychological Association and the Florida Psychological Association.

This dissertation was prepared under the direction of the chairman of the candidate's supervisory committee and has been approved by all members of the committee. It was submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and to the Graduate Council and was approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August 3, 1954

C. H. Myers
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Dean, Graduate School

RESEARCH COMMITTEE:

C. H. Myers

Chairman

H. H. Myers

R. J. Myers

W. W. Zimmerman

James Thompson